

Atty. Docket No. 014811-215.116
Application. No. 10/525,290

REMARKS

Claims 27, 30, 31, 32 and 33 were previously amended wherein the X moiety is not present in the molecule, and as such, fits with the scope of claim 1. Notably, claim 1 recites that "L" is only an optional linker. Thus if "X" described in claims 27 and 30 is not present and L from claim 1 is not included as recited in the amended claims then claims 27 and 30 these claims fit within the scope of claim 1.

In claim 31, X is not present, L is not present but "m" is equal to 2 and thus fits within the scope of claim 1.

In claim 32, X is not present, and L is $-C(O)NH-$, thus fits within the scope of claim 1.

In claim 33, X is not present as recited in claim 33, L is $-C(O)X-$ wherein X is an alkyl and thus fits within the scope of claim 1.

In claim 34, L is $-C(O)NHx-$ wherein X is an alkyl and $n = 1$, thus fits under the scope of claim 1.

Claim 41 fits within the scope of claim 1 because L is $C(O)NH$, then there is a PEG string and R is an alkyl.

Claim 42, like 41 fits within the scope of claim 1 because "m" is equal to 2.

Conclusion

In the event that any issues remain, Examiner Nwaonicha is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (919) 286-8089 to resolve same.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 6, 2007

Atty. Docket No. 014811-215.116
Application. No. 10/525,290

Marianne Fuierer
Registration No. 39,983
Attorney for Applicants
Moore & Van Allen